

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS  
HOUSTON DIVISION

KIRK MACKEY,	)	
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
	)	CIVIL ACTION
vs.	)	
	)	Case No. 4:25-CV-03043
1100 QUITMAN LLC and	)	
FIESTA MART, L.L.C.,	)	
	)	
Defendants.	)	

**COMPLAINT**

COMES NOW, KIRK MACKEY, by and through the undersigned counsel, and files this, his Complaint against Defendants, 1100 QUITMAN LLC and FIESTA MART, L.L.C., pursuant to the Americans with Disabilities Act, 42 U.S.C. § 12181 *et seq.* (“ADA”) and the ADA’s Accessibility Guidelines, 28 C.F.R. Part 36 (“ADAAG”). In support thereof, Plaintiff respectfully shows this Court as follows:

**JURISDICTION**

1. This Court has original jurisdiction over the action pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331 and 1343 for Plaintiff’s claims pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 12181 *et seq.*, based upon Defendants’ failure to remove physical barriers to access and violations of Title III of the ADA.

**PARTIES**

2. Plaintiff, KIRK MACKEY (hereinafter “Plaintiff”) is, and has been at all times relevant to the instant matter, a natural person residing in Houston, Texas (Harris County).

3. Plaintiff is disabled as defined by the ADA.

4. Plaintiff is required to traverse in a wheelchair and is substantially limited in performing one or more major life activities, including but not limited to: walking and standing.

5. Plaintiff uses a wheelchair for mobility purposes.

6. In addition to being a customer of the public accommodation on the Property, Plaintiff is also an independent advocate for the rights of similarly situated disabled persons and is a “tester” for the purpose of enforcing Plaintiff’s civil rights, monitoring, determining and ensuring whether places of public accommodation are in compliance with the ADA. His motivation to return to a location, in part, stems from a desire to utilize ADA litigation to make Plaintiff’s community more accessible for Plaintiff and others; and pledges to do whatever is necessary to demonstrate the plausibility of Plaintiff returning to the Property once the barriers to access identified in this Complaint are removed in order to strengthen the already existing standing to confer jurisdiction upon this Court so an injunction can be issued correcting the numerous ADA violations on this property. (“Advocacy Purposes”).

7. Defendant, 1100 QUITMAN LLC (hereinafter “1100 QUITMAN LLC”), is a Texas limited liability corporation that transacts business in the State of Texas and within this judicial district.

8. Defendant, 1100 QUITMAN LLC, may be properly served with process for service via its Registered Agent, to wit: c/o Thomas Andersen, Registered Agent, 2000 Bering Drive, Suite 909, Houston, TX 77057.

9. Defendant, FIESTA MART, L.L.C. (hereinafter “FIESTA MART, L.L.C.”), is a Texas limited liability corporation that transacts business in the State of Texas and within this judicial district.

10. Defendant, FIESTA MART, L.L.C., may be properly served with process for service via its Registered Agent, to wit: c/o CT Corporation System, Registered Agent, 1999 Bryan Street, Suite 900, Dallas, TX 75201.

**FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS**

11. On or about February 9, 2025, Plaintiff was a customer at “Fiesta Mart,” located at 1020 Quitman Street, Houston, TX 77009, referenced herein as “Fiesta Mart”. *See* Receipt attached as Exhibit 1. *See* also photo of Plaintiff attached as Exhibit 2.

12. Defendant, 1100 QUITMAN LLC, is the owner or co-owner of the real property and improvements that Fiesta Mart is situated upon and that is the subject of this action, referenced herein as the “Property.”

13. Defendant, FIESTA MART, L.L.C., is the lessee or sublessee of the real property and improvements that Fiesta Mart is situated upon and is the subject of this action.

14. Plaintiff’s access to the business(es) located at 1020 Quitman Street, Houston, TX 77009, Harris County Property Appraiser’s property identification number: 0032280000001 (“the Property”), and/or full and equal enjoyment of the goods, services, foods, drinks, facilities, privileges, advantages and/or accommodations offered therein were denied and/or limited because of his disabilities, and he will be denied and/or limited in the future unless and until Defendants, 1100 QUITMAN LLC and FIESTA MART, L.L.C., are compelled to remove the physical barriers to access and correct the ADA violations that exist at the Property, including those set forth in this Complaint.

15. Defendant, 1100 QUITMAN LLC, as property owner, is responsible for complying with the ADA for both the exterior portions and interior portions of the Property. Even if there is a lease between Defendant, 1100 QUITMAN LLC and the tenant allocating responsibilities for

ADA compliance within the unit the tenant operates, that lease is only between the property owner and the tenant and does not abrogate the Defendant's independent requirement to comply with the ADA for the entire Property it owns, including the interior portions of the Property which are public accommodations. *See* 28 CFR § 36.201(b).

16. Plaintiff lives 12 miles from the Property.

17. Given the close vicinity of the Property to the Plaintiff's residence, Plaintiff often travels by the Property.

18. Plaintiff has visited the Property twice before as a customer and advocate for the disabled. Plaintiff intends to revisit the Property within six months after the barriers to access detailed in this Complaint are removed and the Property is accessible again. The purpose of the revisit is to be a return customer to Fiesta Mart and to determine if and when the Property is made accessible and for Advocacy Purposes.

19. Plaintiff intends on revisiting the Property to purchase and/or receive services as a return customer as well as for Advocacy Purposes but does not intend to re-expose himself to the ongoing barriers to access and engage in a futile gesture of visiting the public accommodation known to Plaintiff to have numerous continuing barriers to access, as such, Plaintiff is currently dissuaded from returning to the Property until the barriers to access are removed.

20. Plaintiff travelled to the Property twice before as a customer and as an independent advocate for the disabled, encountered the barriers to access the Property that are detailed in this Complaint, engaged those barriers, suffered legal harm and legal injury, and will continue to suffer such harm and injury as a result of the illegal barriers to access present at the Property.

21. Although Plaintiff did not personally encounter each and every barrier to access identified in Plaintiff's Complaint, Plaintiff became aware of all identified barriers prior to filing

the Complaint and because Plaintiff intends on revisiting the Property as a customer and advocate for the disabled within six months or sooner after the barriers to access are removed, it is likely that despite not actually encountering a particular barrier to access on one visit, Plaintiff may encounter a different barrier to access identified in the complaint in a subsequent visit as, for example, one accessible parking space may not be available and he would need to use an alternative accessible parking space in the future on his subsequent visit. As such, all barriers to access identified in the Complaint must be removed in order to ensure Plaintiff will not be exposed to barriers to access and legally protected injury.

22. Plaintiff's inability to fully access the Property and the stores within in a safe manner and in a manner which inhibits the free and equal enjoyment of the goods and services offered at the Property, both now and into the foreseeable future, constitutes an injury in fact as recognized by Congress and is historically viewed by Federal Courts as an injury in fact.

### **COUNT I** **VIOLATIONS OF THE ADA AND ADAAG**

23. On July 26, 1990, Congress enacted the Americans with Disabilities Act 42 U.S.C. § 12101 *et seq.*

24. Congress found, among other things, that:

- (i) some 43,000,000 Americans have one or more physical or mental disabilities, and this number is increasing as the population as a whole is growing older;
- (ii) historically, society has tended to isolate and segregate individuals with disabilities, and, despite some improvements, such forms of discrimination against individuals with disabilities continue to be a serious and pervasive social problem;
- (iii) discrimination against individuals with disabilities persists in such critical areas as employment, housing public accommodations, education,

transportation, communication, recreation, institutionalization, health services, voting, and access to public services;

- (iv) individuals with disabilities continually encounter various forms of discrimination, including outright intentional exclusion, the discriminatory effects of architectural, transportation, and communication barriers, overprotective rules and policies, failure to make modifications to existing facilities and practices, exclusionary qualification standards and criteria, segregation, and relegation to lesser service, programs, activities, benefits, jobs, or other opportunities; and
- (v) the continuing existence of unfair and unnecessary discrimination and prejudice denies people with disabilities the opportunity to compete on an equal basis and to pursue those opportunities for which our free society is justifiably famous, and costs the United States billions of dollars in unnecessary expenses resulting from dependency and non-productivity.

42 U.S.C. § 12101(a)(1) - (3), (5) and (9).

25. Congress explicitly stated that the purpose of the ADA was to:

- (i) provide a clear and comprehensive national mandate for the elimination of discrimination against individuals with disabilities;
- (ii) provide a clear, strong, consistent, enforceable standards addressing discrimination against individuals with disabilities; and

\* \* \* \* \*

- (iv) invoke the sweep of congressional authority, including the power to enforce the fourteenth amendment and to regulate commerce, in order to address the major areas of discrimination faced day-to-day by people with disabilities.

42 U.S.C. § 12101(b)(1)(2) and (4).

26. The congressional legislation provided places of public accommodation one and a half years from the enactment of the ADA to implement its requirements.

27. The effective date of Title III of the ADA was January 26, 1992 (or January 26, 1993 if a defendant has 10 or fewer employees and gross receipts of \$500,000 or less). 42 U.S.C. § 12181; 28 C.F.R. § 36.508(a).

28. The Property is a public accommodation and service establishment.

29. Pursuant to the mandates of 42 U.S.C. § 12134(a), on July 26, 1991, the Department of Justice and Office of Attorney General promulgated federal regulations to implement the requirements of the ADA. 28 C.F.R. Part 36.

30. Public accommodations were required to conform to these regulations by January 26, 1992 (or by January 26, 1993 if a defendant has 10 or fewer employees and gross receipts of \$500,000 or less). 42 U.S.C. § 12181 *et seq.*; 28 C.F.R. § 36.508(a).

31. The Property must be, but is not, in compliance with the ADA and ADAAG.

32. Plaintiff has attempted to, and has to the extent possible, accessed the Property in his capacity as a customer at the Property as well as an independent advocate for the disabled, but could not fully do so because of his disabilities resulting from the physical barriers to access, dangerous conditions and ADA violations that exist at the Property that preclude and/or limit his access to the Property and/or the goods, services, facilities, privileges, advantages and/or accommodations offered therein, including those barriers, conditions and ADA violations more specifically set forth in this Complaint.

33. Plaintiff intends to visit the Property again in the very near future as a customer and as an independent advocate for the disabled, in order to utilize all of the goods, services, facilities, privileges, advantages and/or accommodations commonly offered at the Property, but will be unable to fully do so because of his disability and the physical barriers to access, dangerous conditions and ADA violations that exist at the Property that preclude and/or limit his access to the Property and/or the goods, services, facilities, privileges, advantages and/or accommodations offered therein, including those barriers, conditions and ADA violations more specifically set forth in this Complaint.

34. Defendants, 1100 QUITMAN LLC and FIESTA MART, L.L.C., have discriminated against Plaintiff (and others with disabilities) by denying his access to, and full and equal enjoyment of the goods, services, facilities, privileges, advantages and/or accommodations of the Property, as prohibited by, and by failing to remove architectural barriers as required by, 42 U.S.C. § 12182(b)(2)(A)(iv).

35. Defendants, 1100 QUITMAN LLC and FIESTA MART, L.L.C., will continue to discriminate against Plaintiff and others with disabilities unless and until Defendants, 1100 QUITMAN LLC and FIESTA MART, L.L.C., are compelled to remove all physical barriers that exist at the Property, including those specifically set forth herein, and make the Property accessible to and usable by Plaintiff and other persons with disabilities.

36. A specific list of unlawful physical barriers, dangerous conditions and ADA violations which Plaintiff experienced and/or observed, or was made aware of prior to the filing of this Complaint, that precluded and/or limited Plaintiff's access to the Property and the full and equal enjoyment of the goods, services, facilities, privileges, advantages and accommodations of the Property include, but are not limited to:

**ACCESSIBLE ELEMENTS:**

- i. Across the vehicular way in front of Fiest Mart, two of the four accessible parking spaces are not located on the shortest distance to the accessible route leading to the accessible entrances in violation of Section 208.3.1 of the 2010 ADAAG Standards. This barrier to access would make it difficult and dangerous for Plaintiff to access the units of the Property from these accessible parking spaces as the far location increases the likelihood of traversing into the vehicular way and getting struck by a vehicle or encountering a barrier to access



which stops Plaintiff from accessing the public accommodations offered at the Property.

- ii. Across the vehicular way in front of Fiest Mart, one of the four accessible parking spaces is missing an identification sign in violation of Section 502.6 of the 2010 ADAAG standards. This barrier to access would make it difficult for Plaintiff to locate an accessible parking space.
- iii. Across the vehicular way east of the entrance to Fiest Mart, the access aisle serving the two accessible parking spaces has a width that decreases below 60 inches and is therefore in violation of Section 502.3.1 of the 2010 ADAAG standards. This barrier to access would make it dangerous and difficult for Plaintiff to exit and enter their vehicle while parked at the Property.
- iv. Across the vehicular way east of the entrance to Fiest Mart, the two accessible parking spaces are not located on the shortest distance to the accessible route leading to the accessible entrances in violation of Section 208.3.1 of the 2010 ADAAG Standards. This barrier to access would make it difficult and dangerous for Plaintiff to access the units of the Property from these accessible parking spaces as the far location increases the likelihood of traversing into the vehicular way and getting struck by a vehicle or encountering a barrier to access which stops Plaintiff from accessing the public accommodations offered at the Property.
- v. Across the vehicular way east of the entrance to Fiest Mart, due to the presence of speed bumps, there are vertical rises in excess of ¼ inch blocking the accessible route in violation of Section 303.2 of the 2010 ADAAG standards.

This barrier to access would make it dangerous and difficult for Plaintiff to access public features of the Property as vertical rise in excess of ¼ inch may cause Plaintiff's wheelchair to snag on the vertical rise and tip over.

- vi. Moreover, across the vehicular way east of the entrance to Fiest Mart, due to the presence of speed bumps, the surface slope of the available accessible route leading from the accessible parking spaces to the accessible entrance has a surface slope exceeding 1:10 in violation of section 405.2 of the 2010 ADAAG standards. This barrier to access would make it dangerous and difficult for Plaintiff to access public features of the Property as the extreme surface slope may cause Plaintiff's wheelchair to snag on the vertical rise and tip over.
- vii. Due to a policy of storing shopping carts in the accessible route as well as having the exterior accessible route clear width decrease to less than 36 inches, both the eastern and western sides of the Property lack an accessible route from the public sidewalk to the accessible entrance in violation of Section 206.2.1 of the 2010 ADAAG standards. This barrier to access would make it difficult for Plaintiff to utilize public transportation to access the public accommodations located on the Property.
- viii. The Property has an accessible ramp leading to the accessible entrance to Fiesta Mart with a slope exceeding 1:12 in violation of Section 405.2 of the 2010 ADAAG standards. This barrier to access would make it dangerous and difficult for Plaintiff to access the units of the Property because when ramps are too steep (more than 1:12) it requires too much physical arm strain to wheel up the ramp

and increases the likelihood of the wheelchair falling backwards and Plaintiff being injured.

- ix. The Property has an accessible ramp leading to the accessible entrance to Fiesta Mart where the ground surfaces of the accessible ramp are not stable or slip resistant, or otherwise fail to comply with Sections 302, 303 and 405.4 of the 2010 ADAAG standards. This barrier to access would make it dangerous and difficult for Plaintiff to access the interior of the Property as Plaintiff's wheel could get snagged on the vertical rise and cause the wheelchair to tip.
- x. Inside Fiesta Mart, at the meat counter, there lacks any portion of the counter that has a maximum height of 36 (thirty-six) inches from the finished floor in violation of Section 904.4 of the 2010 ADAAG standards, all portions of the sales and service counter exceed 36 (thirty-six) inches in height from the finished floor and there is no sign or other indication of a policy to assist disabled individuals in wheelchairs due to this barrier. This barrier to access would make it difficult for Plaintiff to properly transact business at the Property as Plaintiff is in a wheelchair which makes his height much lower than a standing individual, so a surface with a maximum height of 36 inches above the finished floor is necessary for Plaintiff to sign credit card receipts.
- xi. Inside Fiesta Mart, at the meat counter, the vertical reach to the meat counter service bell exceeds the maximum allowable height of 48 (forty-eight) inches above the finish floor or ground in violation of Section 308.3.1 of the ADAAG standards. This barrier to access would make it difficult for Plaintiff to reach the bell, preventing Plaintiff from being able to request assistance, due to the

fact individuals in wheelchairs are seated and have lower reach ranges than individuals who stand.

- xii. Defendants fail to adhere to a policy, practice and procedure to ensure that all facilities are readily accessible to and usable by disabled individuals.

### **FIESTA MART RESTROOMS**

- xiii. Due to the placement of a toilet paper dispenser within 12” above the side grab bar, there is inadequate space between the grab bar and objects placed above the grab bar in violation of Section 609.3 of the 2010 ADAAG Standards. This barrier to access would make it difficult for Plaintiff to safely transfer from the wheelchair to the toilet and back.
- xiv. The accessible toilet stall door is not self-closing and violates Section 604.8.1.2 of the 2010 ADAAG standards. This barrier to access would make it difficult for the Plaintiff and/or any disabled individual to safely and privately utilize the restroom facilities.
- xv. The lavatories and/or sinks in the restrooms have exposed pipes and surfaces and are not insulated or configured to protect against contact in violation of Section 606.5 of the 2010 ADAAG standards. This barrier to access would make it difficult for Plaintiff and/or any disabled individual to safely utilize the sink as the pipes underneath the sink typically have sharp surfaces and/or hot pipes, and since individuals in wheelchairs use a sink while seated, their legs are particularly vulnerable to these threats.
- xvi. The height of coat hook located in accessible restroom stall is above 48 (forty-eight) inches from the finished floor in violation of Section 308.2.1 of the 2010

ADAAG standards. This barrier to access would make it difficult for Plaintiff and/or any disabled individual to reach the coat hook as individuals in wheelchairs are seated and have significantly less reach range than individuals who stand up.

37. The violations enumerated above may not be a complete list of the barriers, conditions or violations encountered by Plaintiff and/or which exist at the Property.

38. Plaintiff requires an inspection of the Property in order to determine all of the discriminatory conditions present at the Property in violation of the ADA.

39. The removal of the physical barriers, dangerous conditions and ADA violations alleged herein is readily achievable and can be accomplished and carried out without significant difficulty or expense. 42 U.S.C. § 12182(b)(2)(A)(iv); 42 U.S.C. § 12181(9); 28 C.F.R. § 36.304.

40. All of the violations alleged herein are readily achievable to modify the Property into compliance with the ADA due to the fact the modifications necessary to cure the barriers to access identified in paragraph 36 of this Complaint are the specific types of barriers listed in 28 C.F.R. § 36.304 as readily achievable to modify.

41. Upon information and good faith belief, the removal of the physical barriers and dangerous conditions present at the Property is readily achievable because the nature and cost of the modifications are relatively low.

42. Upon information and good faith belief, the removal of the physical barriers and dangerous conditions present at the Property is readily achievable because Defendants, 1100 QUITMAN LLC and FIESTA MART, L.L.C., have the financial resources to make the necessary modifications. According to the Property Appraiser, the Appraised value of the Property is \$3,103,603.00.

43. The removal of the physical barriers and dangerous conditions present at the Property is also readily achievable because Defendants have available to it a \$5,000.00 tax credit and up to a \$15,000.00 tax deduction from the IRS for spending money on accessibility modifications.

44. Upon information and good faith belief, the Property has been altered since 2010.

45. In instances where the 2010 ADAAG standards do not apply, the 1991 ADAAG standards apply, and all of the alleged violations set forth herein can be modified to comply with the 1991 ADAAG standards.

46. Plaintiff is without adequate remedy at law, is suffering irreparable harm, and reasonably anticipates that he will continue to suffer irreparable harm unless and until Defendants, 1100 QUITMAN LLC and FIESTA MART, L.L.C., are required to remove the physical barriers, dangerous conditions and ADA violations that exist at the Property, including those alleged herein.

47. Plaintiff's requested relief serves the public interest.

48. The benefit to Plaintiff and the public of the relief outweighs any resulting detriment to Defendants, 1100 QUITMAN LLC and FIESTA MART, L.L.C.

49. Plaintiff's counsel is entitled to recover its reasonable attorney's fees and costs of litigation from Defendants, 1100 QUITMAN LLC and FIESTA MART, L.L.C., pursuant to 42 U.S.C. §§ 12188 and 12205.

50. Pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 12188(a), this Court is provided authority to grant injunctive relief to Plaintiff, including the issuance of an Order directing Defendants, 1100 QUITMAN LLC and FIESTA MART, L.L.C., to modify the Property to the extent required by the ADA.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff prays as follows:

- (a) That the Court find Defendants, 1100 QUITMAN LLC and FIESTA MART, L.L.C., in violation of the ADA and ADAAG;
- (b) That the Court issue a permanent injunction enjoining Defendants, 1100 QUITMAN LLC and FIESTA MART, L.L.C., from continuing their discriminatory practices;
- (c) That the Court issue an Order requiring Defendants, 1100 QUITMAN LLC and FIESTA MART, L.L.C. to (i) remove the physical barriers to access and (ii) alter the Property to make it readily accessible to and useable by individuals with disabilities to the extent required by the ADA;
- (d) That the Court award Plaintiff his reasonable attorneys' fees, litigation expenses and costs; and
- (e) That the Court grant such further relief as deemed just and equitable in light of the circumstances.

Dated: June 30, 2025

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Douglas S. Schapiro

Douglas S. Schapiro, Esq.

Southern District of Texas ID No. 3182479

The Schapiro Law Group, P.L

7301-A W. Palmetto Park Rd., #100A

Boca Raton, FL 33433

Tel: (561) 807-7388

Email: [schapiro@schapirolawgroup.com](mailto:schapiro@schapirolawgroup.com)